*MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS*
*19 September, 1973*

*AM*
*10:00* *CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.*

*ADMINISTRATION*

*A. Dates of Next Meetings: 17 October, 1973*
*21 November, 1973.*

*B. Minutes of June, 1973, Meeting.*

*C. Fiscal Year 1975 Budget.*

*D. Amendment to the D.C. Building Code - Delay in Demolition of Historic Structures.*

*E. Georgetown Waterfront Zoning Hearings - Report.*

*F. Chairman's Report on Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.*

*G. Mall Task Force - Report.*

*H. Status of Mechanical Parking Structures - Report.*

*I. H.R. 4540, 93rd Congress: "To reserve a site for the use of the Smithsonian Institution."*

*J. H.R. 4541, 93rd Congress: "To authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan museum support facilities."*

*K. S. 856, 93rd Congress: "To reserve a site for the use of the Smithsonian Institution."*

*SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS*

*A. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development</u>*

*<u>Old Georgetown Act</u>*

*1. O.G. 74-32, 1007 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. - Raze Existing Building.*

*2. Appendix 1.*

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 74-15, 600 22nd Street, N.W. - George Washington University Physical Education Building - Resubmission.

2. Appendix 2.

B. Redevelopment Land Agency

F & G Street Renewal, National Portrait Gallery Treatment, G Street Facade of the Library.

C. D.C. General Services Administration

Eisenhower Convention Center - Preliminary Submission.

D. General Services Administration

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building, 17th & G Streets, N.W. - Environmental Impact Statement.

E. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

Correctional Detention Facility - Site Plan and Elevation - Resubmission.

F. National Park Service, National Capital Parks

1. Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove, Lady Bird Johnson Park, Columbia Island - Preliminary Submission.

2. Seabee Memorial - Resubmission.

G. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Bus Shelter Locations - Site Plans.

H. National Aeronautics and Space Administration

National Space Exploration Memorial - Preliminary Discussion.

I. Department of the Army, Baltimore District Corps of Engineers

United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Domiciliary West "A" Building - Preliminary Submission.

J. Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Photographic Film Library Addition to Naval Photographic Center, Bolling/Anacostia Air Force Base.

K. Consumer Product Safety Commission

New Permanent Seal.

INTERVIEWS

NOON

12:00 Redevelopment Land Agency

F & G Street Renewal, National Portrait Gallery Treatment, G Street Facade of the Library.

12:15 D.C. General Services Administration

Eisenhower Convention Center.

1:00 Lunch and Tour of Convention Center Site and Mall.

2:30 National Park Service, National Capital Parks

1. Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove.

2. Seabee Memorial.

2:45 D.C. Government, Department of General Services

Correctional Detention Facility.

2:50 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Bus Shelter Locations.

3:00 National Aeronautics and Space Administration

National Space Exploration Memorial.

3:15 Department of the Army, Baltimore District Corps of Engineers

U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Domiciliary West "A" Building.

3:20 Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Photographic Film Library Addition to Naval Photographic Center.

3:30 D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

S.L. 74-15, 600 22nd Street, N.W. - G.W.U. Physical Education Building.

*MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS*
*19 September, 1973*

*Meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. at the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.*

| | |
|---|---|
| *Members Present:* | *Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman* |
| | *Hon. Nicolas Arroyo* |
| | *Hon. Kevin Roche* |
| | *Hon. Chloethiel Woodard Smith* |
| | *Hon. George Weymouth* |
| *Staff Present:* | *Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary* |
| | *Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary* |
| | *Mr. William Bogan* |
| | *Mr. Jeffrey Carson* |
| | *Mr. J. L. Sibley Jennings, Jr.* |
| | *Mrs. Nancy Lusher* |
| | *Miss Lynda Smith* |
| *National Capital Planning Commission Staff Present:* | *Mr. Edward Hromanik* |
| | *Mr. Steven Klaus* |

*I. ADMINISTRATION*

*A. Dates of next meetings were set at: 17 October, 1973*
*20 November, 1973.*

*B. Minutes of June, 1973 meeting were approved.*

*C. Fiscal Year 1975 Budget. The Secretary told the Members of only two additions to the Fiscal 1974 Budget. One was a 5% general cost-of-living increase which would apply to expenses and supplies in line with previous years. The other item was a new requirement for government agencies to pay rent to G.S.A. for their office space. The Commission of Fine Arts had been assessed a rent of $16,000. An agency request of $167,000 was approved by the Commission.*

*D. Amendment to the D.C. Building Code. The Secretary told of statements made by him and the Assistant Secretary at the September 13, 1973 City Council Hearings on a proposed delay in demolition for historic structures. The proposed regulation would make a six-month delay possible with recommendation to the Mayor by the Joint Committee on Landmarks in cases of demolition permit application for properly registered historic landmarks. There had been a general agreement that the*

Commission of Fine Arts would administer all similar applications proposing to alter the exterior of such landmarks. The Secretary pointed out that this could result in a small additional work load for the staff, which could be handled by present employees. There would also be a possibility of adding another advisory board of architectural review in the event of additional large historic districts, such as Capitol Hill or Anacostia. The Commission approved this course of action, with the Chairman instructing the staff to continue strong liason with all aspects of this city-wide preservation effort.

E. Georgetown Waterfront Zoning Hearings. The Assistant Secretary told the Members of a hearing held by the D.C. Zoning Commission on August 6, 1973 to consider special waterfront zones. One of these would be the Georgetown Waterfront and the other the Southwest Waterfront. The Chairman then reiterated the statement he made for the Commission at the hearing, saying that rezoning the Georgetown Waterfront, in particular, was long overdue if this part of the historic fabric was to be a vital urban asset to the Capital. The Assistant Secretary said that as soon as minutes or transcripts of this statement were available copies would be available for the Members and the Commission record. Exhibit A.

F. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Progress. The Chairman told of the first meeting of the newly-constituted body charged with overseeing the replanning and development of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue. He stated that there were still many details to work out, but that the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission Staff was now at work. He stated that one particular feature of the previous plan had been tunneling Constitution Avenue under a National Gallery north plaza and Pennsylvania Avenue. The Members pointed out that this raised questions about the setting of the National Gallery of Art. The Members generally discussed the problem, feeling that it was an issue to investigate further. Later in the day the Commission visited the site.

G. Georgetown Planning Group, Georgetown Waterfront Preliminary Development Plan and Program. The Assistant Secretary discussed the report which had been sent to the Members over the summer for their review. Most elements of the report were in harmony with the Commission's previous review, but there were two items of note that he recommended a Chairman's letter in response to. One of the points was that the Commission of Fine Arts was doing an ineffective job of judging the architectural propriety of proposed projects on the waterfront; the other was a statement that some aspects of the Commission's relationship with the District Government were illegal. The Commission agreed on a letter to the Planning Commission, offering to meet with the consultants to clear up any possible misunderstandings. The Members made it quite clear that this was not to be an effort to influence the

independent judgement of the consultants, but to make up for the lack of communication so far. Exhibit B.

H. Mall Task Force. The Assistant Secretary reviewed a special inter-agency task force for coordinating development and review of Mall Master Plans. The Committee was established by the Park Service to include representatives from the Planning and Fine Arts Commissions, the National Gallery, Smithsonian, and D.C. Highway Department. Park Service intention was to submit an early design scheme to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission in November, 1973.

I. Status of Mechanical Parking Structures. The Secretary reviewed a letter received from the D.C. Corporation Counsel's office making mechanical parking structures subject to normal building permit review. One particular case of machines to stack cars two up in an opne Georgetown lot had prompted the Commission inquiry into why there was no permit review on these items which affected appearance and safety. The District Government will now have control over these items, and in Georgetown the Commission of Fine Arts will review them as well. Exhibit C.

J. H.R. 4540, 93rd Congress and S. 856, 93rd Congress: "To reserve a site for the use of the Smithsonian Institution." The Secretary told how there had been a general understanding that the last remaining building site on the Mall would be used for a Smithsonian Institution museum. This site located at Third and Independence Avenue would be officially reserved for this use, by the legislation. The Commission approved the concept.

K. H.R. 4541, 93rd Congress: "To authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan museum support facilities." The Secretary said that this was a general authorization, not a specific building or site, but a normal function of the Institution. The Members had no objection.

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 74-32, 1007 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. - Raze Existing Building. The Secretary showed photographs of a deteriorated, non-distinguished small residence, long boarded up and unused. This building was isolated within the boundaries of the Gallagher Lumber Company and had no part of any significant row or grouping of buildings. The Commission had no objection to its removal. Exhibit D.

2. Appendix 1, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 74-15, 600 22nd Street, N.W. - George Washington University Physical Education Building - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary showed drawings for landscaping the project and material samples for the building. The Commission approved the landscaping, which broke up the parking lot and screened the building from 23rd Street. The material samples were not approved, since the Commission felt that a light asbestos trim panel was far too white, and the brick proposed had too high a contrast. A resubmission was requested.

2. Appendix 2, approved. Exhibit E.

B. Redevelopment Land Agency

F and G Street Renewal, National Portrait Gallery Treatment, G Street Facade of the Main D.C. Library. The Secretary presented a series of drawings depicting landscaped pedestrian malls facing both sides of the Old Patent Office and the south side of the Library. These would be made in former street rights-of-way. Previous schematic drawings showed a more complicated design, and the proposed showed a classical rectilinear scheme both with and without steps restored on the south facade of the Patent Building. The Commission favored elimination of the step restoration because the street grade was 11 feet lower than when the steps were in place. The design for remaining features was felt too complicated, but the concept of tree-shaded pedestrian plazas was approved. The Commission met with RLA representatives later in the morning.

C. D.C. General Services Administration

Eisenhower Convention Center - Preliminary Submission. The Assistant Secretary presented a model and drawings for this 300,000 square foot convention hall with a steel truss roof and concrete panel walls. The Center would have the main hall on the second floor which would run across 9th Street. The ground floor would have commercial shops on the south, and meeting rooms, lobby, and limited parking facilities on the ground floor. He pointed out that there were some questions about the vast bulk of the building in relation to Mount Vernon Square, in particular the facades facing west toward the White House and a setback of 170 feet facing the Square. The Members generally felt that the building should be given more study to increase the structural expression of the roof, and to eliminate the paper architecture look of the concrete panel exterior surfaces. Further discussion was held later in the morning with project representatives.

D. General Services Administration

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building, 17th and G Streets, N.W. - Environmental Impact Statement. The Secretary told of a general question which had arisen for the location of this building outside the downtown area where it could seed development. The proposed site could better serve one of the Executive agencies. However, the site had been approved by the Planning Commission earlier in the month. The Chairman suggested that the Commission of Fine Arts should have no objection to an office building in this location if properly designed, but its user was out of the purview of the Commission. The other Members agreed that the Commission would have no comment on the location of this agency.

E. D.C. Government, Department of General Services

Correctional Detention Facility - Site Plan and Elevations of Wall - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings for the perimeter wall and landscaping. The Commission felt that the designs matched their expectations and previous advice and approved them. The proviso was added that the landscape design should be subject to coordination with the eventual master plan of this D.C. Government complex. Exhibit F.

F. National Park Service, National Capital Parks

1. Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove, Lady Bird Johnson Park, Columbia Island - Preliminary Design. The Assistant Secretary showed several sketches of a concept for placing an informal grove of pine trees with a simple marker on the Maryland Avenue axis with the Capitol. The Commission commended the approach. The possibility of a single rock as the focus of the memorial was questioned, but the Commission expected to see specific designs as they were developed. Exhibit G.

2. Seabee Memorial - Resubmission. The Assistant Secretary presented three alternatives to the original design. All shared a smaller background for the bas relief and side panels for the commemorative plaques - to surround the central figure. One scheme was to put the revised group on the originally suggested site, another was the center of the playing fields at Gravelly Point, and the third was in a 40 foot wide niche on Memorial Drive. The Commission approved the scheme on Memorial Drive, which now conformed to the Master Plan for the drive. Exhibit H.

III. INTERVIEWS

A. Redevelopment Land Agency

F and G Street Renewal, National Portrait Gallery Treatment, G Street Facade of D.C. Main Library. The project was represented by Messers Press and Sherman and Miss Newhaus of the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency, the sponsors. Also present from the public buildings adjacent to the projects were Milton Byam and Virginia Phillips of the

D.C. Public Library; Harry Lowe of the National Collection of Fine Arts; and Mike Carrigan of the National Portrait Gallery. Mr. John R. Myer the architect was also present. The Chairman told the party assembled that the Commission of Fine Arts had looked at the schemes presented and felt that the effort was commendable and that it would be agreeable to eliminate the south stairway restoration for the Old Patent Office. Though the Commission was delighted with the concept of a shade tree cover for the proposed plazas, they looked forward to a more detailed presentation in the future. Mr. Sherman indicated that more detailed drawings would be submitted to the Commission as they were developed. Exhibit I.

B. D.C. General Services Administration

Eisenhower Convention Center. The project was represented by Messers Caputo and Gordon of the District Government and Messers Becket, Brenno, Boyce, Henry, and Gorman of Welton, Becket and Associates, the architects. The Chairman informed the party that further study was being recommended. The features specifically mentioned included finding a more desirable exterior material and structure expression. The Commission had no objection to the shape or location of the building and were sympathetic to the time and cost factors involved in any redesign, but felt that the importance of the project merited more attention. Copy of transcript is attached. Exhibit J.

IV. LUNCH BREAK AND TOUR

A. The Commission recessed for lunch at 1:15.

B. Tour. Mrs. Smith and Messers Arroyo, Roche, Weymouth, Atherton, and Myer went by car to inspect the site of the Eisenhower Convention Center, also examining the exterior of the Old Main Library at Mount Vernon Square. The group then toured the proposed plaza locations on G and F Streets, then looked at the potential location of a submerged Constitution Avenue in front of the National Gallery. Everyone agreed that the probable effect to Constitution Avenue would be unpleasant and that the 7th Street facades of the National Archives and the Gallery would be adversely affected as well. Mr. Roche stated that he would hope to diminish the use of underground automobile tunnels in the monumental core. The group then went to see the Air and Space Museum and Hirshhorn Gallery construction progress. The final inspection was the 15th Street Mall intersection at the base of the Washington Monument. The Secretary pointed out that this area was going to be one of the difficult design decisions coming in review of the Mall Master Plan. The party then returned to the Commission's offices.

V. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS (continued)

G. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Bus Shelter Locations - Site Plans. The Assistant Secretary showed a series of small drawings proposing numerous specific locations for the small bus stop shelters previously approved by the Commission. The specific locations were all being submitted to the Commission for their review. The Commission authorized the Staff to approve the shelter locations, and to give the Commission an on-site inspection trip when some of the shelters were erected. Exhibit K.

H. National Aeronautics and Space Administration

National Space Exploration Memorial - Preliminary Discussion. The Secretary recounted a meeting with Mrs. Levy, the Assistant Secretary and himself where the concepts for such a memorial were discussed. It was hoped that the Commission could steer the National Aeronautics and Space Administration away from an overly literal piece of sculpture and perhaps towards a site in conjunction with the new Air and Space Museum on Independence and 7th, S.W. Further discussion was held later in the afternoon with Mrs. Levy.

I. Department of the Army, Baltimore District Corps of Engineers

United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Domiciliary West "A" Building - Preliminary Submission. The Assistant Secretary presented a model and drawings for this dormitory complex for retired military men. Though only two wings of the complex were to be constructed in the near future, the Home planned future expansion with four more units and a saloon-dining facility to be connected by a series of covered walks. The Buildings were designed around central courts which would be open on the ground level on one side. The four brick structures would have sun shades over each window to minimize the sun load in summer. The Chairman stated that architectural continuity with the rest of the post was minimized because the housing complex would be separated by the golf course, and a planting buffer screened it from the adjacent community. Mr. Roche questioned the circular symmetry of the site plan. Mrs. Smith suggested that a smaller scale "village type" of residential scale couls achieve a better social community. Mrs. Smith was appointed by the Chairman to be spokesperson for the Commission at an interview with project representatives later in the day.

J. Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Photographic Film Library Addition to Naval Photographic Center, Bolling-Anacostia Air Force Base. The Secretary presented a series of drawings and photographs showing two small additions to this existing utilitarian building. There were no conflicts with the master planning of this section of the post and the proposed additions would not be visible from off the post. The Commission approved the design.

K. Consumer Product Safety Commission

New Permanent Seal. The Secretary showed photographs of a previously approved temporary seal for the Safety Commission which was based on the Great Seal, with an eagle surrounded by lettering. The new design was a contemporary "logo" made up of curved letters. The Members felt that the temporary seal was far superior and disapproved the new design. Exhibit L.

V. INTERVIEWS (continued)

C. National Aeronautics and Space Administration

National Space Exploration Memorial. Mrs. Lillian Levy represented the agency and had a general discussion with the Members on the project. The points stressed were having a jury for the proposed competition of experts in the arts, not political or agency officials; a non-objective solution would be better than combining literal figures or machanical devices; an agreeable location would be at the Air and Space Museum. The Chairman offered continued assistance

D. Department of the Army, Baltimore District Corps of Engineers

U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Domiciliary West "A" Building. The project was represented by Mr. D. N. Oler of the Baltimore District and Mr. Grayson H. Isbell of the Home. The architect, Mr. Roy J. Carroll, Jr., was spokesman for the group. The Chairman told the representatives that Mrs. Smith would report the Commission's findings. Mrs. Smith suggested that the project would benefit from restudy with a smaller community scale, getting away from the traditionsl barracks look and forced geometry of the proposed design. The architect agreed that such a restudy would be possible. The Chairman indicated that the Commission would be happy to see further design studies as soon as developed. Exhibit M.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:15 p.m.

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: All right, ladies and gentlemen, once again we are convened; and we are ready to go and the next witness will be on behalf of the Fine Arts Commission, the Honorable J. Carter Brown.

Mr. Brown, welcome, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. CARTER BROWN, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

MR. BROWN: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman and other members of the Commission:

For the record, my name is J. Carter Brown, and I am Chairman of Fine Arts. On my right is Mr. Charles Therson, who is Secretary to the Commission.

I would like to begin by commending the Zoning Commission for undertaking these hearings and this study at this time. It is my understanding that what we have been circulating is in the nature of a staff report. I think, therefore, we have a very difficult problem, one that is a very pressing problem, and one on which the District of Columbia would do well ~~not~~ to move on as quickly as possible.

I do not side with people who say that preservations should remain and we should wait for further studies and further refinements. I think it is imperative that this study move quickly. We like the one that is there with

the potential level of the Georgetown waterfront.

I should say at the outset that speaking as one of a seven-member Presidentially-appointed Commission, there has not been a heightening of urgency since this document was circulated to us. We have filed a report from the staff as we were requested by your staff; but my testimony has to be seen in the light of that and as an individual member.

The Commission, however, has been concerned with the Georgetown waterfront for a long time. It has, as you well know, specifically indicated her responsibility in terms of design and the structure of Old Georgetown.

I would like to add that as a Commission, our interest is broad as well and we are interested in the District of Columbia as a whole, as a Federal city; we are interested in all its waterfronts.

Anything that can be gained here that will help the other waterfront property of the city is certainly in my way of thinking in the city's interest.

This is one of a particular waterfront. At the time, it is the gateway to the city, driving in from the Maryland side is one of the most beautiful drives within the approaches to any city in the world. It is fortunate that you pass by the Georgetown waterfront. The other side of the city, as you drive in, is on the approaches from National Airport and seeing the beauties of the edge of this

city that meets the Potomac River and the progress that is being made, and so forth, in terms of the city as a whole, in that area, it is a beautiful view.

It is important, also, of course, as a historical valuable. It was the hub of activities in this community even before a Federal city was planned for this area; and this gives it the edge in the voting since it has developed in that unique way.

Georgetown is a community of which the entire city can be proud. It is more than a historical district. There are other concentrations of early architecture which reminds one of the beauty of Charleston, South Carolina, or Savannah, Georgia. But none of these has the historical value of Georgetown.

Also, the history of this area is a long one and it was a very active city and a lot of these forces are responsible for the quality of Georgetown above -- north of M Street.

South of M Street there is something of a difference. If one tries to analyze why Georgetown north of M Street is different, I think there are two basic elements and these are important to analyze if one is attempting by zoning or any other means to extrapolate into this original district.

Now, first of all, is its scale. There is a

humanistic scale that relates to the mode of human beings which gives people a tremendous sense of well being when they are continually surrounded by beautiful scenes. In my judgment, if one looks at the buildings in an architectural sense, it has certain heights, it has its own scales and other beautiful features.

Historically, people have a sense of well being for these things.

In Georgetown, you can look at the texture of the buildings, the whole thing; the way they fared, the size, the density; all of these things have to be taken into consideration. It gives a sense of well being.

The second aspect, I think, also contributes to the position of Georgetown as an element of his city. It is great, when you learn the various parts of the city. In Washington, it is kind of an urban city with people jumping into space and this is one of the reasons the people prefer to live in cities.

There is a wide scope to this city that is generated by the impartiality of human beings and what is familiar to them. The District of Columbia is an area which has the potential to attract people and it is something to be touched and valued along with the historical value that exists in this area.

The question then is, how do you modernize the

plusses of the Georgetown area without destroying them in the processes.

Obviously one could take historical values and emphasize them to the extent that one would try to recreate a kind of historical plus. But I think in doing that, we would be turning the clock back. This would be like in the 18th century when we still had slavery.

Historically, the waterfront area is a very mixed bag; it has to be -- a residential area and a multiplicity of commercial in it. Our own judgment about the future of it is that this makes a beautiful opportunity to ascertain its market use. The proposals that are before the Zoning Commission, therefore, have many things about it to which I will allude.

First of all is the factor of rezoning at all. Anything would be an improvement over the industrial use for this area; that is, which is obsolete. I will not make any attempt to eliminate new industrial uses of that land.

However, I think that while we are at it now, that there is a -- we can do better, that heights are the key; and this is one of the essential factors. We have no official position on the height at this point in our staff report. We say that the W-1 area should not exceed 40 feet; and it is particularly important because of the back yard limitations in the area.

Now, so far as that area is concerned, the W-3, there are 60 feet in terms of this being commercial. The offices, however, 90 feet should be allowed only in the most exceptional case, in a PUD or other situation and certainly then only when all other factors are taken into consideration to come within that 90-feet limitation.

In the balance, one should notice the importance of the cornice lines on M Street; the south side of M Street should at no cost be allowed to go above 60 feet. The 90-feet possibilities which are contained in proposals should be considered totally unacceptable. Anything that protects the existing row houses along the canal has to be done; and this is one of the proofs of the whole Georgetown area and the urban market as a whole.

The idea of limiting the scale and restyle establishments is again a great plus. This is one of the thorniest problems that we have here today. I figure this as totally unacceptable, as banning the automobile from the historical districts, as they do in Rome. This is probably the overall intent wherever there are only beautiful pedestrian spaces, and certainly the pedestrian is to be encouraged in every possible way.

This is how the scale and urban techniques that have been talked about in the beginning are realized. It can only be realized when you make this investment; and that

means in terms of finding a solution that will work. I think parking outside the area, many bus systems, to get people within walking distances from their goal.

As to the waterfront itself, we feel that a 50-foot setback the entire length of the waterfront would be a minimum. I think that would be a desirable situation from the standpoint of view of the whole city as well as the circulation that it would permit for people in bicycles and people on foot.

We have already made such determinations and we are faced with the Inland proposals and that was aceded to our situation, that the southern edge of this structure be pulled back.

This we feel is important along the entire edge of what is basically W-1 designations in this current proposal.

For the area west of 31st Street and below K Street along the water's edge, this is one area in which the silent work of the Georgetown Planning Group seems to be at variance with. That is our term. That would make a wonderful opportunity for an urban waterfront park~~ing~~, a unique park~~ing~~ situation.

This would be the kind of urban develoment that I have referred to earlier that could have a restaurant and boat house and kiosiks and an outdoor theater. But in the

sense of urban parking, there would be an excess to give it a lot of excitement of its own. I am sure that you may have further questions, but in general, these are our comments on it.

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: We certainly thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. STANTON: I just want to thank Mr. Brown.

MAYOR WASHINGTON: I certainly associate myself with this and appreciate the interest of the Fine Arts Commission.

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: Thank you very much.

MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Brown, just a couple of questions relating to the function of the Fine Arts Commission in the Georgetown area.

Specifically, relating to the design control -- and I think that we have in the record a beautiful statement from you in regards to these elements of the functions of the Commission.

MR. BROWN: I would be happy simply to quote the legislation of Public Law 808, 81st Congress and give you the D. C. Code reference, with the September date of September 22, 1950, in part reads that "the Commission of the District of Columbia, before issuing any permit for the construction, alteration, reconstruction, of any building within said Georgetown District, should refer such plans to the Commissio

of Fine Arts for a report as to the exterior architectural types, appearances, and texture of the material of the exterior structure. "

This is subject to public inspection from public highways -- then it goes on to say that if there is no report within 45 days that approval can be assumed. But this is the situation.

MR. ROBBINS: Now, the practical matter of what happens when a set of building plans is sent to you from the District Building or either the developer brings them over, they are due to you within 45 days, period.

Now, as a practical matter, what happens at that point?

MR. BROWN: They are reviewed first by the staff and then by the full Commission, and the parties are invited to discuss these questions after the Commission has deliberated and has made its determination and as a practical matter, the Commission has turned down some proposals.

MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Brown, the city does not give the Commission absolute veto power?

MR. BROWN: As a practical matter, the Commission has been able to work these things out for the most part. It has always been worked out.

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: Any further questions, gentlemen?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Brown, I just want to thank you for

your very intelligent comment, and I find that you support the basic goals, which is to find an appropriate market, market use to be established in this area.

My question really is as a result of the questions Mr. Robbins asked.

Does the Fine Arts Commission have certain prerogatives with respect to the approval or disapproval of proposed designed -- and I take it that the prerogative was taken at the time the building was now under construction at K Street and Wisconsin Avenue?

MR. BROWN: That is right.

MR. WHITE: Have you found that to be appropriate from your standpoint?

MR. BROWN: We sent it back many times. In fact, there was a case where we were forced to ask for a building height. It had a height limitation of 90 feet.

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: Any further questions, gentlemen?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN NEVIUS: Mr. Brown, we appreciate your comments.

Our next witness will be Mrs. Nancy Long, of the C&O Canal National Historical Park Commission.

STATEMENT OF MRS. NANCY LONG, C&O NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION

MRS. LONG: Mr. Chairman and member of the Distric

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO — CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
JANE O. DART — EDWARD STONE, JR.
KEVIN ROCHE — GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324


12 November, 1973

Dear Martin,

Per your request of 7 November, 1973, I am sending some of the Commission of Fine Arts comments on the GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT AREA STUDY, PHASE IIA REPORT, PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROGRAM. Enclosed are the statement by Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman of the Commission, at the Zoning Commission hearings on the proposed Waterfront Zoning, and the preliminary staff report on the proposal. Statements by me and Mr. Atherton, Secretary of the Commission, made before the City Council on city-wide preservation problems are also included. There are items within these statements which apply specifically to the Georgetown Waterfront and reflect long standing Commission policy and experience.

This Commission has informally reviewed the PHASE IIA REPORT and looks forward to seeing the waterfront model on November 20th. While examining the report, the Commission found references to the Old Georgetown Act on pages 12, 13, and 57, one of which states that part of this Commission's relationship with the District of Columbia is probably illegal. The Commission has suggested contact between the staff and the Consultants to guarantee that the latest and most accurate information is fully available on our operation. There has been, thus far, no contact between the Commission and the Consultants about the operation of the Act. This can be easily rectified.

Sincerely yours,

Donald B. Myer
Assistant Secretary

Mr. Martin Rody, Coordinator
Georgetown Waterfront Planning Group
National Capital Planning Commission
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B.

# Government of the District of Columbia

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL
DISTRICT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 4, D. C.

BUS:NSN

JUN 26 1973

The Honorable J. Carter Brown
Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
708 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

I have received your letter regarding double deck parking structures. You specifically requested my view on whether Commission review of such structures is necessary prior to their installation in Georgetown under provisions of the Old Georgetown Act. I understand that the Department of Economic Development does not require issuance of a permit prior to installation of stacked parking devices and thus the Commission is not afforded the opportunity of review.

The Old Georgetown Act (Act of September 22, 1950, 64 Stat. 903, Section 5-801 - 5-805, D. C. Code, 1967 edition) provides, in part:

> "In order to promote the general welfare and to preserve and protect the places and areas of historic interest, exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, before issuing any permit for the construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building within said Georgetown district . . . shall refer the plans to the National Commission of Fine Arts for a report as to the exterior architectural features, height, appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction which is subject to public view from a public highway." [Section 5-802, D. C. Code, 1967 edition.]

Exhibit C.

Building permits are required under the D. C. Building Code for "the erection, construction, reconstruction, alteration, conversion, repair, removal or razing of all buildings and structures and their appurtenances, or parts thereof, unless exempted . . ." Section 3-132, D. C. Building Code.

Section 3-202 of the Building Code includes the following definitions:

> "Building. A roofed structure for the shelter, support, or enclosure of persons, animals, chattels, or movable property of any kind."
>
> "Structure. Anything constructed, including a building, which requires fixed location on the ground, or attached to something having a fixed location on the ground."

It is my understanding that the Department of Economic Development has considered the double deck parking devices as mechanical equipment and building permits have not been required for their installation. Upon review of the applicable regulations, I am of the view that parking devices for the stack-parking of automobiles do have a fixed location on the ground and thus are structures as defined in the Building Code.

Having concluded that a building permit is required for installation of such parking equipment, there remains the issue of whether permits for parking structures are properly reviewable by the Commission of Fine Arts.

In a lengthy opinion given to the President on January 15, 1960, the Attorney General discussed the legislative history and applicability of the Old Georgetown Act. 41 Op. A.G. 441. In discussing the authority of the Commission, the Attorney General concluded that the statute, which in terms mentions only "buildings", should be read to include such appurtenances as signs, outside lights, fences and walls. The Attorney General further elaborated as follows:

> "It has been frequently held that the word "building" as used in a statute, deed, or contract may be construed as signs, fences, and walls, depending on the connection and purpose with which the word is employed. . . . It is unreasonable to believe that Congress meant to subject to the scrutiny of the Fine Arts Commission the exterior architectural features of buildings in the Old

> Georgetown district subject to public view from a public highway and at the same time to give the Commission no control over such appurtenances as signs, outside lights, fences, and walls which are equally exposed to public view; these if uncontrolled might readily disturb the general architectural appearances of the area." [Case citations omitted.] 41 Op. A.G. 450, 451.

Upon consideration of the rationale contained in the Attorney General's Opinion and review of the applicable law, I am of the view that, before issuance of any permit for stacked parking structures, it is required that the architectural plans be referred to the Commission of Fine Arts for its report.

I am advising the responsible District of Columbia officials of this decision by forwarding a copy of this letter to them.

Sincerely,

C. FRANCIS MURPHY
Corporation Counsel, D.C.

cc: Julian Dugas, Director
Department of Economic Development

Arthur Hatton, Executive Director
D. C. Zoning Commission

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

19 September, 1973

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| OG 73-146 | R-3106 N Street, N.W.<br>Thomas F. Hagen | Renovation of existing garage/carriage house and addition of new garage. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 7/2/73 | |
| 150 | 1259 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>C J Concepts | Repaint and reletter existing sign. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. Design and location of proposed sign not recommended. Existing "import closeout" sign was put up without Fine Arts approval. Recommend removal of existing sign. Suggest simplification or refinement of letter style. Consider painting sign on glass or placing sign behind show window. 6/13/73 | |
| 151 | 1047 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.<br>Georgetown Inland North Corporation | Remove existing building. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/13/73 | |
| 152 | 1048 30th Street, N.W.<br>Georgetown Inland North Corporation | Remove existing building at west edge of lot. Duvall Foundry is not to be demolished. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/13/73 | |
| 153 | 3056 M Street, N.W.<br>Nature's Products | Sign for health food store made of wood with yellow background and green letters. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. No objection to size or location of sign. Products shall not be named on sign. Suggest restudy of letter spacing and thickness. Consider painting heavier letters or applying letters to background. 6/13/73 | |
| 154 | 3216-18 M Street, N.W.<br>Snider & Levy | Sign, 10" letters of wood installed on plaque over old entrance. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 7/2/73 | |

Exhibit D.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

19 September, 1973

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| OG 73-155 | 1048 Potomac Street, N.W.<br>James L. Dixon Company | Canvas canopy over door. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. No objection to awning os solid green, omitting scallops. 6/13/73 | |
| 156 | 3029 M Street, N.W.<br>Fred J. Marroon | 24" x 24" unlit square hand painted sign. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/25/73 | |
| 157 | 3318 Volta Place, N.W.<br>Col. E.E. Myers | New windows in east wall. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/13/73 | |
| 158 | 1805 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>General Electric | New door cut in existing building. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. No objection to cutting door. Suggest new door have head and side trim to match main door. Suggest new single door to match existing doors. 6/13/73 | |
| 159 | 1063 31st Street, N.W.<br>H. Warnecke | One double-faced sign, 18" x 3'. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 7/2/73 | |
| 160 | 2714 P Street, N.W.<br>Mrs. Burgess | Six-foot wooden fence. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 7/2/73 | |
| 161 | 1008 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.<br>Georgetown Inland West Corporation | Remove existing building. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 7/2/73 | |
| 162 | 1432 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>Douglas Segal | Identification sign - 20" x 10' - to be mounted against building. |
| ACTION: | Do nit issue permit. Location of sign not recommended. Colors should be indicated in future. Suggest sign behind glass. 7/2/73 | |

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 73-163* | *2934 M Street, N.W.*<br>*John Yannikos* | *Erect one hanging wall sign and remove previously painted wall sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 7/2/73* | |
| *164* | *1663 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Robert & Joy Blair* | *New sign for antique shop.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Existing sign can be reused only if cut in size to simple rectangle with letters only. Put trim strip on edge. Suggest location centered over door. 7/2/73* | |
| *165* | *1502 27th Street, N.W.*<br>*Robert Enzel* | *Add screen wall to area over one-story show window for sun deck.* |
| *ACTION:* | *See previous action. Do not issue permit. C.B. units not recommended, concrete planter, as shown, not recommended. Suggest engineering review. 7/2/73* | |
| *166* | *1737 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*J. Gill Company* | *Erect 7' x 30" sign - black wood letters mounted on grey brick.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Double line lettering in this location not recommended. Suggest restudy. Question permit status of show windows. 7/2/73* | |
| *167* | *R-3264 K Street, N.W.*<br>*District of Columbia* | *Raze and clear site.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 6/27/73* | |
| *168* | *3124 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Leon Petrossian* | *Against the wall sign 2' x 3', yellow color and black lettering.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Drawings not adequate. Question permit status of 1st floor facade. 7/2/73* | |
| *169* | *1208 31st Street, N.W.*<br>*Linda L. & Robert A. Joy* | *Erect a sign for store.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 7/2/73* | |

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 73-170* | *1620 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Simon Cohen* | *Erect two signs - 5' x 10" and 2' x 3'.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Character of sign not recommended. Suggest alternate locations be studied, including behind glass. 7/2/73* | |
| *OG 74-1* | *1640 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Haehie Chang* | *New sign for dress shop.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Location of sign obliterating part of the architectural detail of this building is not recommended. Character of lettering not recommended. Suggest simple upper case classical letters. Consider sign of new design on wall above bay window or behind glass. 7/19/73* | |
| *2* | *1614 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Hairport, Ltd.* | *18" x 11" wooden letters placed on a back board.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Question size of sign. Style of lettering and lower case not recommended. Suggest simple upper case classical letters. 7/19/73* | |
| *3* | *3056 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Nature's Pantry* | *Wood sign over front of store (resubmission refer to OG 73-173).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Slanted upper and lower case letters not recommended for this particular building. Recommend all upper case letters similar to previous sign, but heavier and with more refined spacing. No objection to original tree motif. 7/19/73* | |
| *4* | *3345 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Spencer Diamond* | *Relocate existing sign and enlarge bay window.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Request additional information on exact finish of front wall, specifically how transom windows will be treated where sign is now located and behind proposed location. 7/19/73* | |

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 74-* | | |
| *5* | *3401 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Mac's Pipe & Drum, Inc.* | *Awning over window at front of building.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Recommend more subtle color awning to blend into the mostly pastel color schemes adjacent. Recommend, if possible, covering projecting hood with awning. 7/19/73* | |
| *6* | *1502 27th Street, N.W.*<br>*Robert Enzel* | *Screen wall for new sun deck (resubmission refer to OG 73-165).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit for alternate #1. 7/13/73* | |
| *8* | *3040 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Chesapeake Restaurant* | *Canvas pull-up awning.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Awning not recommended for half of the face of this particular building on basis of overall massing composition. Suggest an awning could be used on west side of building, particularly at entrance to restaurant. 7/19/73* | |
| *9* | *1804 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Peter C. Lagonas* | *Erection of sign - 18" x 8'.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Wall sign not recommended on basis of character of lower case horizantal composition on this building at proposed location. Signs not recommended in transom or door, as they obliterate the architectural character of this building. No objection to hanging sign shown in photographs for this location back from sidewalk. Exception requested for this hanging, projecting sign. 7/19/73* | |
| *10* | *1545 35th Street, N.W.*<br>*Mrs. Oscar Cox* | *Erect cedar sawtooth fence six feet high.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 7/19/73* | |
| *11* | *1663 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Green Scene* | *18" x 15' wood sign flat against building.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Location of sign over trim not recommended for this building. Suggest exception be granted for hanging sign, or sign location be restudied, possibly inside show window. 8/13/73* | |

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

19 September, 1973

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| OG 74- | | |
| 12 | 1079 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>Dr. G. Steinberg | Sign. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to style of letters. Recommend somewhat smaller letters with specifically more space between words and less height. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 13 | 1001 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>Donald Stetson Davis | Sign. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request clarification on relationship of proposed signs to actual use of premise. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14 | 1363 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>National Shoes, Inc. | Paint exterior, new sign, interior remodel, drywall and paint. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Internally illuminated sign not permitted in Georgetown. Suggest simple, classical upper case letters, or sign inside show window, 18" behind glass. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 15 | 1007 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.<br>W. T. Galligher & Bro., Inc. | Remove existing building. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request additional photographs clearly showing rear of structure and condition of interior. Also request photo showing more of streetscape to indicate present setting. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 16 | 1643 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>New Couture Corporation | Place 16' x 18" sign on front of building. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Location near cornice not recommended. Lower case letters not recommended. Suggest sign be removed as per D.C. order. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 17 | 1642 29th Street, N.W.<br>Calvin Cafritz | Poolhouse, to include pool equipment room, bathrooms, garbage enclosure. |

ACTION: Issue permit. 8/13/73

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | 3345 M Street, N.W.<br>Spencer Diamond | Repair front (resubmission refer to OG 74-4). |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to moving sign. Scheme can be recommended if sign is flat against building wihtout outriggers and sign is located across transom lintel and does project above parapet. 8/13/73

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 74-19* | *1241 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*The Bootery, Inc.* | *Sign flat on building, 2' x 12', affixed to top of bow show window approximately 8' from sidewalk.(resubmission refer to OG 73-43).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Material does not clearly indicate location of sign. Question lettering style. See previous action. 8/13/73* | |
| *20* | *1231 31st Street, N.W.*<br>*Gilbert Kinney* | *Interior alterations to 1231 31st Street, N.W., formerly known as 1231, 1233, and 1235 31st Street, N.W.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Request additional information in form of clear, accurate street elevation drawing showing sash. Question shape and proportion of garage door and its relation to entrance door head. 8/13/73* | |
| *21* | *3034 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Philip Moreau* | *Display sign for art gallery (resubmission refer to OG 73-123).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 8/13/73* | |
| *22* | *1614 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Hairport, Ltd.* | *New capital letters - upper case classical (resubmission refer to OG 74-2).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 8/13/73* | |
| *23* | *3299 M Street, N.W.*<br>*J.A. Granados* | *New sign painted on front of building.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Recommend removal of illegal sidewall sign. Suggest sign be painted on wood panel with classical letters. 8/13/73* | |
| *24* | *3056 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Nature's Pantry* | *Painted sign on wood (resubmission refer to OG 74-3).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 8/22/73* | |
| *25* | *1003 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Door Store, Inc.* | *A mural painting by Godfred Beardsher in 1972.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Design out of character with historic district. Letter style and spacing should be more refined. Suggest simple Roman capital letters on a plain background. 8/22/73* | |

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

19 September, 1973

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| OG 74-26 | 2901 M Street, N.W.<br>National Permanent Federal Savings & Loan Association | Construct two-story, no basement commercial structure. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Suggest either excellent contemporary design or exact, faithful reproduction Federal style design for this prominent location on axis with Pennsylvania Avenue. Proposed pseudo-Williamsburg colonial style is inappropriate to historic district. If traditional details are used they must be authentic with respect to trim, opening proportions, roof shapes, and materials. 8/22/73

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 27 | 1231 31st Street, N.W.<br>Gilbert Kinney<br>Resubmission refer to OG 74-20. | Combine three residences into one residence. Proposed interior alterations, build addition on rear and rebuild existing rear porch. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Overall bland facade character not recommended for this project. Suggest a scheme which involves less change to existing features of three houses involved. Specifically question shutterless casement windows and the entrance arch. Perhaps existing doorway can be re-used. 8/22/73

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 28 | 3160 O Street, N.W.<br>Joseph Levine | Erect two signs. |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request better photographs to illustrate entire facade and all sign faces. 8/22/73

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 29 | 1363 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>National Shoes, Inc. | Electrical sign: upper case standard letters/ opaque trough lighted (resubmission refer to OG 74-14). |

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Letter style and colors are too "modern" for historic district. Recommend calssical, Roman, non-glossy lettering. Submit samples if bright colors are pursued. Recommend limiting sign to size of transom only. 8/22/73

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 30 | 3345 M Street, N.W.<br>Spencer Diamond<br>Resubmission refer to OG 74-18. | Sign to be installed flat against building without outriggers. Locate sign across transom. Will not project above parapet. |

ACTION: Issue permit. 8/22/73

---

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 74-* | | |
| *31* | *1218 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*1218 Wisconsin Avenue, Inc. T/A Third Edition* | *Sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Shape and style of sign not suited to use over glass in this building. Suggest total restudy or using glass inside show window. 8/22/73* | |
| *33* | *3401 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Mac's Pipe & Drum* | *Erect awning (resubmission refer to OG 74-5).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 8/24/73* | |
| *34* | *1663 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Robert & Joy Blair* | *Sign (resubmission refer to OG 73-164).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. Recommended as revised. 8/22/73* | |
| *35* | *1737 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*J. Gill Realtors* | *Mount black wood letters on grey brick, 15' x 8" - words "Georgetown Uniform Co." (resubmission refer to OG 73-166).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 9/13/73* | |
| *36* | *1231 31st Street, N.W.*<br>*Gilbert Kinney*<br>*Resubmission refer to OG 74-27* | *Revise interior, rebuild existing rear porch, build addition on rear. Combine 3 existing residences into 1 residence.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 9/4/73* | |
| *37* | *1054 31st Street, N.W.*<br>*Marriott Corporation* | *New sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Proposed banner too large. Recommend restudy with less vertical proportioned letters. 9/13/73* | |
| *38* | *1241 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Canterbury Tales, Ltd.* | *Erect one-story accessory storage building for retail clothing and shoe store on ground floor.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. No objection to design of building pending approval of brick sample. 9/13/73* | |

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *OG 74-* | | |
| *39* | *1633 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Barbara A. B. McAfee* | *Sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Proposed sign is too large. 9/13/73* | |
| *40* | *3116 M Street, N.W.*<br>*Marc Fleisher* | *Replace old sign (OG 73-88) with new sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Do not recommend the character of sign proposed for exterior of this building. Suggest restudy with a simple classicla letter and plain rectilinear sign to better match the definite character of this building. Sign proposed would be suitable on interior or behind glass. 9/13/73* | |
| *42* | *3214 P Street, N.W.*<br>*Canterbury Tales, Ltd.* | *Canvas awning.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Continuous awning around corner not recommended for the particular geometry of this building. Suggest three individual awnings, one over each show window and another over door, be considered. Also recommend against black from maintenance standpoint - suggest another color. 9/13/73* | |
| *44* | *1806 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.*<br>*John Paul* | *3/4" plywood sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Material submitted does not show exact proposed location of sign. the size proposed, however, appears excessively large and out of proportion with this particular building. Would suggest a more horizantal sign for this use. 9/13/73* | |
| *45* | *3130 Dumbarton Street, N.W.*<br>*Cornelius Gibson* | *Enclose existing porch area. Make existing third floor same size as existing second floor.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Informal review only, do not issue permit. No objection to concept proposed, subject to final details, materials, etc. Do not recommend new rectangular window in third floor side of existing front wing. 9/13/73* | |

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

19 September, 1973

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| SL 73- | | |
| 52 | 600 22nd Street, N.W.<br>George Washington University | New physical education building. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. Request submission to CFA of final landscape plans and material samples. Action includes assumption of additional building being built over adjacent 23rd Street parking lot. 6/20/73 | |
| 53 | 1345 E Street, N.W.<br>American Snacks, Inc. | New sign, brown letters. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/26/73 | |
| 54 | 2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.<br>Savage Fogarty Company | Revision to office building. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit for this design. Recommend design as approved in S.L. 73-36. 6/18/73 | |
| 55 | 2020 Pierce Mill Road, N.W.<br>H. H. Jensen | 9' x 8' exterior deck attached to existing stairs, with 30" privacy fince. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 6/25/73 | |
| SL 74- | | |
| 1 | 2300 Virginia Avenue, N.W.<br>Columbia Plaza | Free standing sign. |
| ACTION: | Issue permit. 8/1/73 | |
| 2 | 508 H Street, N.W.<br>Kaneko O. Chan | 2' x 10' flourescent sign to be mounted flat against building. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. Internally illuminated plastic sign unacceptable. Recommend opaque-face, back lighted letters. Also omit Coca-Cola sign. 8/3/73 | |
| 3 | 601 15th Street, N.W.<br>Mary Ann Baker | 2' x 10' flourescent signs to be mounted against building on both 15th Street and F Street sides. |
| ACTION: | Do not issue permit. Internally illuminated plastic sign not permitted. Omit Coca-Cola advertizing. 8/30/73 | |

Exhibit E.

*REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT*

*19 September, 1973*

| *NO.* | *ADDRESS AND OWNER* | *PROJECT* |
|---|---|---|
| *SL 74-* | | |
| *4* | *2130 P Street, N.W.*<br>*Quadrangle Development Corporation* | *New 10 story apartment house with retail stores on first floor (resubmission refer to SL 73-33).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. Submit coordinated sign studies and material samples. Submit design and colors of construction fence and signs. 7/6/73* | |
| *5* | *2200 P Street, N.W.*<br>*Gulf Oil Corporation* | *Renovate existing service station.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Approved for all renovation and site work shown on drawings. Signs and lighting should be separately submitted for review prior to issuance of their permits. 8/1/73* | |
| *6* | *2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Savage Fogarty Company* | *Office Building - revised submission (resubmission refer to SL 73-54).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Approved as preliminary deisgn. Request submission of working drawings prior to issuance of permit. Also request material smaples. 8/13/73* | |
| *7* | *615 15th Street, N.W.*<br>*Brenda Crowder* | *Replace old sign with new face. Black letters on yellow background.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Internally illuminated plastic sign not acceptable under D.C. Building Code. 8/6/73* | |
| *8* | *633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.*<br>*Indiana Associates* | *Install vertical wall mounted flagpole on penthouse wall roof.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Issue permit. 8/22/73* | |
| *9* | *731 15th Street, N.W.*<br>*Thomas F. Scott* | *Sign.* |
| *ACTION:* | *Do not issue permit. Return metal brackets to inside of wall opening. 8/24/73* | |
| *10* | *615 15th Street, N.W.*<br>*Brenda Crowder* | *Replace old sign with new face. Sign will not be illuminated (resubmission refer to SL 74-7).* |
| *ACTION:* | *Approved provided yellow plastic background is changed to grey (no objection to painting). 8/24/73* | |

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary



708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324


5 October, 1973

Dear Col. Starobin:

The Commission of Fine Arts approved final wall and landscape plans for the new D.C. Correctional Facility at 19th and Massachusetts, S.E., during its September 19th meeting. We appreciate the District Government's efforts to utilize this Commission's suggestions throughout the design.

Our final suggestion reflects back to our first, that the District Government prepare a master plan for the D.C. General Hospital grounds and vicinity. We still believe that such a plan is of prime importance. The Commission therefore gives its approval for the project, with the hope that the landscaping and parking will be sufficiently flexible to integrate with the master plan as you develop it.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lt. Col. Sam D. Starobin, Director
D.C. Dept. of General Services
613 G St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Exhibit F.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

5 October, 1973

Dear Mr. Fish:

This will confirm the Commission's approval on 19 September of preliminary designs for the Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove on Columbia Island.

Besides detailed landscaping and pavement plans, the only remaining question the Commission has is the exact form the actual marker is to take.

There was also a question of the functionality of the kink in the footbridge. If it were straightened out, it would simplify the approach to the grove.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Manus J. Fish, Acting Director
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit G.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

5 October, 1973

Dear Mr. Fish:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on September 19th, approved revised designs for the Seabees Memorial to be located in one of the niches on the north side of the Memorial Drive approach to Arlington Cemetery.

It is our understanding that the site will conform to the overall master plan for all the niches on Memorial Drive in terms of size and geometry.

It is also our understanding that no portion of the sculptural group will extend above the full height of the hedge at its maturity, which is some two feet above its present level.

Please let us know if there is any question about the basis for our approval.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Manus J. Fish, Acting Director
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit H.

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary



708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324


5 October, 1973

Dear Mr. Mister:

I am glad to report the Commission of Fine Arts' approval on September 19th of revised preliminary designs for the special treatment of F and G Streets next to the National Portrait Gallery.

As you know, we had requested the architects to study the possibility of restoring the steps on the south side of the Gallery. We appreciate their study and we agree with their conclusions that the resulting design is not all that successful, largely due to the fact that F Street has been considerably lowered, and the steps would have to project that much farther into the street. We are also sympathetic to the geometry and the general character of the landscaped areas on both sides of the Gallery as now conceived. The modest use of water and level changes has a restraint much more in keeping with the classical facades of the Gallery and the Tariff Building and represents a marked improvement over the original submission.

Our next meetings are scheduled for October 17th and November th, and we will be happy to meet with you further on this project.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Melvin A. Mister, Director
Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I.

MR. SHERMAN: I should have mentioned that these represent early stages of the design drawings. As they're further developed, of course we'll be coming back to you with just the sort of details you have raised.

MR. BROWN: If there are points of disagreement with any of that finding, I think we can spare everyone's time.

MR. JOHN MYER: I think you understood it very well.

MR. SHERMAN: May I just confirm all the illustrations shown on the board have been discussed in your remarks, not just the Portrait Gallery you addressed yourself particularly to, the National Collection and Library.

MR. BROWN: Great. We have great confidence in their views on this, and I think as far as the city goes, we continue to be very enthusiastic about really making these streets come alive.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. JOHN MYER: Thank you.

MR. MYER: Shall we see the convention center people also?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Chairman, we have Mr. Caputo with us who is the liaison with the District Government and is



CO., INC.

handling this project for the District Government. Would you like to say a few words to begin with?

MR. CAPUTO: Yes, we are very privileged to present the project to you this morning. We brought along the architect joint venture firm to make a presentation to you.

Mr. Hank Brennan, the Project Director of the joint venture. That is Welton Becket, Gray and West, and H.D. Nottingham and Associates. Hank, I guess you can briefly go through the description of the project.

MR. BRENNAN: Just a quick run-through I think. Then we can discuss any questions. First of all, the site itself and location as selected bounds a four-block area with the H.Street mall all the way to 10th Street and from H Street up to New York and terminating at Mount Vernon Square. In this four-block area, I Street will be closed; however, 9th Street will be maintained as a major artery and become one of t major constraints in our design.

In addition to this, major points of traffic coming to the project will be from the new subway stations that will be developed, the closest one being at G and 7th Street.

We do hope to have an underground tunnel developed linking the project to the nearest subway station. Trucks will be entering the project at both levels right at the

EPORTING CO., INC.
chusetts Avenue, N.E.
, D.C. 20002
666

intersection of I and 10th and can come down 10th Street or com in from I Street.

First of all on the upper level, because of the progra requirement which was determined 300,000 feet on open level, exhibit space and requirements for loading and public movement it took the entire site area, almost the entire site area and did require that we bridge 9th Street. For this reason the projects had to be put at the second level. To try to minimize the light we regraded 9th Street, putting as much slope as we could in this area. We've held the light of this hall 21 feet above H Street which in turn because of the rise in grade is about 11 or 12 feet above New York Avenue, so we have a split entry type of situation along New York at most levels.

Then on the lower level, because of the footprint of the exhibit hall itself, major area, covered area has been developed, and the constraints of the budget were such that we had to limit construction in the first stage to the major elements, being a meeting room that was flexible and expandable to 4,000 people, parking for 100 people and of course all of ou circulation requirements. The future expansion of our meeting rooms will take place here (indicating) along with the kitchen and restaurant expansion. Loading for the lower level will take place opposite I Street and the ramp leading up to the

ORTING CO., INC.
setts Avenue, N.E.
.C. 20002
6

upper levels at the same point and central mechanical space at this point.

We have also made provisions for retail shops along H Street. H Street became one of the major concerns in the project because by its siting, it in a sense became the back door and we didn't want to treat it that way. A large arcade was created under the loading area and space set aside for retail shops. Further shops will be developed along the H Street Mall.

The major vehicular access will be through 9th Street with large drop-off areas for buses which will be primarily the chartered bus variety for trade shows and taxi drop-offs here. Additional drop-offs along New York Avenue for both taxis and public drop-off.

The requirement limiting parking to only 100 people was based on studies that were made to reduce the amount of additional traffic into the area and this will be set aside for special parking only (indicating).

There is right now about 6,000 cars available in the neighborhood which will be especially available on weekends and evenings when we will get the heavy load on the public type exhibits, where we'll be most apt to have car traffic.

Now exhibit hall itself is designed, as I say, on

PORTING CO., INC.
usetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002
66

300,000 square feet of open space. There will be eight columns, each column designed as a pair supporting a box truss system which will be spanning at four points, clear span being 240 feet with 9-foot cantilvers.

Secondary trusses in east-west direction will be 10-fo deep and will also be cantilevered 90 feet with 100-foot span. This gives you maximum open space and efficiency and economy in the system by use of overhangings,balance with the clear span itself, we get maximum use of truss and greatly simplify tremendous expansion problems we'll have, one being at the center and of course perimeter of the hall itself. Each space is between 24 by 360, total being 720 feet across the lobe itself is almost 7800 feet long. Scale and dimensions we're dealing with are tremendous. Of course this brought us to our major problem. This sketch gives a little bit of feeling of the interior. We're trying to express the structure and mechanical system as honestly as possible, to keep it basically simple and maximize the open space within.

MR. BROWN: How much height have you got to the lower?

MR. BRENNAN: Lower is 25 feet to 4 points, secondary trusses 40 feet, of course between trusses which would be available.

Now on the exterior, and believe me, the scale is the

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002

thing that was of tremendous concern to us, unlike most convention centers we've seen anywhere near the size of this, they're generally open spaces, plenty of room around them, and they take a very monumental setting. We tried to break down the scale as much as possible to relate the experience of a pedestrian in all areas, just by wherever possible using the elements we had to deal with. Eighth Street mall of course is a very important pedestrian access, treated as a major entry point which feeds into what we are calling the memorial lobby at this point(indicating on model), which then relates to a major square being designed opposite Mt. Vernon Square. Outdoor public space which also will be part of the memorial aspect of the project from this point, escalators will go up to the second level, across 9th Street. Additional escalators will be opposite an entrance from 10th and New York which will also come up and across and the entire lobby will be developed in clear glass to emphasize the public functions and to lighter the structure of the building.

Use of roofs, the high roof itself is at this point 16 feet above New York and 73 feet at this point above H Street The lowest roofs are 20 feet lower than that. At this point we're only dealing with a 42-foot high roof and setbacks. Extensions of the roof will help to lower the building and kee

EPORTING CO., INC.
chusetts Avenue, N.E.
n, D.C. 20002

it at a scale consistent with the present structures in the area.

Now one of the things I think we have to keep in mind is the entire area. This building will have a dramatic change in it. Present zoning is 90 feet height and can go as high as 110 feet if certain bonuses are awarded. I think its safe to say in time that is going to happen. But the heights for budget reasons as well as our functional space requirements, thi was all the height we could justify.

Mechanical penthouses have been organized at the eight points on the roof, to give us the maximum efficiency in distribution of duct work in minimizing cost; at the same time they serve to indicate beginnings of developing a pattern on the roof. The extent of this roof is such that someone looking down on it, we want to look at the mechanical system as an advantage to us, not a disadvantage.

The other major concern, as I said before, was H Street. I think because of the loading dock, I think it probably becomes the most controversial. I might say also we indicated the loading dock at 8th Street. It simply couldn't be at New York. You know which side becomes your interest is a problem but the deep overhanging and screening wall--we have a 12-foot height parapet which will become our storage,

ORTING CO., INC.
usetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002

important part of the program requirement for the exhibits. It will all serve to screen the trucks visually.

Acoustically is another problem we're dealing with and our intent is to maintain the noise levels that are existent right now on the site. Based on studies we have made to date, noise level during the daytime will be an equivalent approximate to what we'd experience at a point across the street. However, we have to face the fact that convention centers of this size, when you have a major facility going on, they generally load 24 hours a day, trucks coming in and going out. We could very well have a hotel across the street. If we can't handle this through sound absorption we may have to contain this space, thinking of doing it with clear glass or plastic. We haven't gotten into details but this is our basic thinking on that approach.

I think some of the other sketches give a little feeli of some of the character we're trying to develop. This would be another memorial plaza and memorial lobby, bridge across 9th Street, entrance to 9th Street underpass, then the lobby which extends in front of the exhibit hall.

This sketch is a view in the lobby Lounge looking down the lobby itself. This begins to convey a little bit of the scale we are dealing with and how we're trying to handle it.

EPORTING CO., INC.
chusetts Avenue, N.E.
n, D.C. 20002

That sketch is taken from the corner of 9th Street NW and H. It shows the arcade and treatment for the overhang of t trucks. We're trying to lighten that and break it and use the clear, long overhanings.

MR. ROCHE: Does that show skylights across the top?

MR. BRENNAN: That again is an acoustical problem, those are open or closed. The idea is it would allow light to come through either as skylights or open.

MR. ROCHE: Or open?

MR. BRENNAN: Or open, yes. And there are weather considerations we have to take into account also when it's open. We're looking right now at a deep cantilever, 35 or 40 feet there.

MR. BROWN: You will be storing crates outdoors?

MR. BRENNAN: Basically, yes.

MR. BROWN: If they're open, these crates will be rained on.

MR. BRENNAN: It's quite common they are. Most facilit that are out in the open, they don't even bother to cover their loading. Because this is such an integral part of the project we have to cover and screen it but if we could leave the open wells up there, that would reduce the weight as well as the cost for those cantilevers.

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002

MR. ROCHE: If you don't have to cover the loading and don't have to cover the crating which in fact is not normally done, why the cantilever?

MR. BROWN: Just leave that part of the roof open?

MR. BRENNAN: You could. We felt it added to the design of the building.

MR. BROWN: That might help you with your scale problem when you get to the residential shopping.

MR. BRENNAN: On materials right now we're looking at a light pre-cast concrete, lightly textured, warm tone, and I basically keeping it to those materials right now and then the clear glass.

MR. BROWN: Well, we are delighted to have the opportunity to take a look at this in its preliminary stages and we can get an idea of how you are approaching this problem. Problem is an understatement given the scale demands which are absolutely huge. It was pointed out the whole capitol fits in the lower portion of the building. You realize what you are dealing with. In a hitherto residential part of town.

The question, taking it really back to design philosoph that concerns us the most is the extent to which the structure that is being used gets expressed in the building, as it so handsome on the inside. You really know what is holding those spans up and it's a great achievement and is exciting visually. What concerns us is the danger of a building of this scale

ORTING CO., INC.
setts Avenue, N.E.
.C. 20002

looking as if it had been sort of packaged, had been [illegible] around with something which is flimsy. I mean we all know the hole Kennedy Center fell into. Of course that was an effort to be monumental but comes out kind of pseudomonumental, looks as if it were really made of cardboard and if you push, the whole thing will come down, so here is an opportunity to try to get away from that.

We are very aware of the exciting site of this from the point of the city. After all, New York Avenue is a major entrance to the city, there's a park down on the west side, and is the view to the White House, from the White House. There is that marvellous axial mall up from the National Portrait Gallery National Fine Arts Building, the view down from Mt. Vernon Square, the Library which is one of the nicest buildings we have so that it becomes an immensely critical project, as I am sure you are aware. That's why the Fine Arts Commission, which spends a lot of time on very minor things around the city, has really a strong conviction about this building, as it will be very visible.

We're also aware that some of the most successful convention centers like the McCormick Hall in Chicago have a very different site situation, although we do feel that in that case, the guts of the building have been expressed well and one

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.

gets a sense of the diversity of design.

But we have reservations about what we see here in terms of what is being done to express the guts of it. [illegible] looks like a detail of scale, but that overlap, for example, on the roof is something which we haven't been able to [illegible] exact function of. Of course visually it helps to reduce the bulk of it.

The facade down here on N Street at least [illegible] scale-breaking elements which of course is absolutely vital. I guess every building has to have a back and what happens by default, 10th Street has become the real back end and this of course is a very sensitive facade from the point of view of the view up New York Avenue and there's quite a bit of unrelieved space there.

The concept of setting back on the north side [illegible] and I think that the vestpocket park you are creating there will be an urban asset. A lot depends on what happens across the street from it eventually, but I realize that is beyond your purview. But it responds well to the Library and the park and I think that will work, although until we have more detail, it is hard to visualize, the scale is so big, how overpowering, even setting it down as you've tried to do. Some of these will be but at least formally it gets you away from

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.

just a great big Kleenex box which is certainly [illegible] the Kennedy Center fell into.

But this is the basic area of concern and [illegible] important we have a chance to take it really back to [illegible] philosophy at this stage.

MR. BRENNAN: Well, I think part of your [illegible] very well taken and our concern isn't just in expressing the structure, in this case the box which is a major element, could go up as well as down and still achieve the same thing in the structural system. If it went up for instance, it would also contain mychanical penthouses and we considered this both ways.

I think what we were a little bit afraid of is some of the problems of the Kennedy Center, the expression of Rockefeller Place, we don't have the kind of setting they have. We're trying to play down actually purposely this line (indicating on model).

I think the roof itself is going to be mostly [illegible] by people from office buildings, high-rise buildings around, and we did want to break that tremendous plane up.

MR. ROCHE: I think your philosophy of, let's say, reducing the impact of this thing is certainly one we'd [illegible] to subscribe to. However, I think the way in which you are doing it is you'll perhaps not be able to achieve it because the

PORTING CO., INC.
Avenue, N.E.

idea of building a steel structure, and this would be a very marvellous steel structure, it has to be used to solve the functional problems but to do that and then cover it with these large flat planes as if in fact the building were carved out of a solid mass, produces inadvertently I think a much larger scale than would be produced if you accepted the realities of the structure and expressed them because in the nature of things the fact you have these members showing and the panels tend to reduce the scale that would be particularly true on the 10th Street side, to show in fact what you have going on there. Start going up, you have a maintenance shop which could have windows in it, let's say. I also agree the canopy could be taken off the loading docks, that would be a considerably reduced impact there which would give you a little better opportunity to show the main body of the hall.

I think my own personal comments would have to do with the use of concrete as a surfacing material which gives no information at all as to what the real building behind is. You have a great building looking behind all this other stuff, now, and if you let it come out I think you would have a better building, and you would have something of better scale. I think also you would end up with a less formidable entrance. The whole entrance lobby could perhaps be designed in a more

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002

friendly way, more sensitive nature and welcome. The trap of covering steel structures with concrete surfaces is that you produce these very large-scale implistic sculptural forms which obstruct the idea of creating a festive atmosphere. I think it would be a much better building if you just let the realities of the thing express themselves. I don't know if that makes any particular sense to you.

MR. BRENNAN: No, I understand what you are saying. We were trying to simplify and unify and at the same time break up from the pedestrian point of view. An attempt was to screen as much as possible the hall because of the tremendous extent, by showing some steel or the structure. It would not eliminate or reduce the fact this tremendously long plane is here.

MR. ROCHE: It would not reduce the scale but I don't think you would get this cardboard feeling you get when you do it this way, it's certainly an architecture which comes more from enclosing warehouses and will have that effect. The full scale of the building would be much improved if you left some of the smaller activities come to the surface and let the structure which holds it all up, show to some extent. Of course I recognize the fact you have below the 25-foot level, steel or you have to have concrete or whatever but there are ways to do that.

PORTING CO., INC.
usetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002
66

MR. BRENNAN: Actually the model is above it.

MR. BROWN: Chloroform?

MRS. SMITH: I think it would help a bit to try to explain our feeling that this is such an important building for the city that our attempt to see if we could, if we couldn't find a greater form for this, that really [illegible] for our city, because we have very few buildings of [illegible] and importance to work out in effect, and therefore [illegible] of a particular concern. That's the reason for our concern.

MR. BROWN: One thing we'd like an opportunity to [illegible] the next time around, is a model which might indicate [illegible] the environment a little more. Now we realize that circumstances may change. You may for your own purposes want to [illegible] do some removable sections that would show what it would look like if people build up to the zoning envelope but I think it does help to examine the building not in vacuo but in its context. You have provided photographs and so forth but we're really talking three dimensions here and this would help [illegible]

MR. BRENNAN: Well, the point on structure itself, the entire structural system is concrete with the exception of the roof.

MR. ROCHE: It's all poured concrete?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes. Right. If we express this [illegible]

EPORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.
, D.C. 20002

would be just in this roof itself.

MRS. SMITH: That's a mighty big roof.

MR. ROCHE: You could show the poured concrete down below without getting into elaborate architectural concrete. It could be done in a simple, direct way. I would think a more festive, if we may use that old tired phrase, a more festive thing on the north side would be very helpful. Doesn't that sort of reduce the monumentality?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I think it's very hard to visualize exactly what the feeling would be, going in. I think it's fairly handsome, the statement that it now makes, but at this scale, at this stage of detail, it's very hard to know how much festivity it is going to project.

I think that it will sparkle at night and it will be rather inviting when you have glass. It's always hard to visualize what the necessary mullions and everything are going to do to the experience of it.

MR. ROCHE: How high is the glass wall?

MR. BRENNAN: Varies between 20 and 40 feet.

MR. BROWN: At least you don't have the sun beating in on it, on the north facade.

MR. BRENNAN: Right. We hope to take advantage of that.

MR. BROWN: Okay, well, unless you all have any further

PORTING CO., INC.
husetts Avenue, N.E.
D.C. 20002

questions of us, we realize that you are [illegible]
and that is something we're very sensitive to and [illegible]
be as helpful as we possibly can. We need [illegible]
and we want to do everything we can to help you [illegible]
keep moving ahead because we realize that you have [illegible]
and so forth. However, this city is going to be around [illegible]
awhile, so is this building, so is the memory of the [illegible]
tion that built it and we want them all to come out [illegible]
much as we can help it.

MR. BRENNAN: I think we agree with you on that. [illegible]
welcome your comments.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Charles, we don't need the D.C. Government on [illegible]
detention facility. [illegible] they be told not to come?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes, they sure can.

(Whereupon, at 1:10 o'clock, p.m. the meeting was [illegible]
recessed for lunch, to be reconvened at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.)

REPORTING CO., INC.
achusetts Avenue, N.E.
on, D.C. 20002

10 October, 1973

Mr. Emanuel Mevorah, Assistant Director
Office of Architecture
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
950 South L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Mr. Mevorah,

The Commission of Fine Arts has the following comments on Metro-bus shelter sites DC-MB-A-58 through DC-MB-A-112:

1. Where the shelters are placed within the line of an existing hedge, we recommend that the hedge be continued onthhree sides of the shelter. This has been designed for the Bladensburg-North Dakota, N.E. stop (DC-MB-A-76), but not for DC-MB-A-58 (in front of the Statler Hilton Hotel on 16th Street), nor for DC-MB-A-60 (in front of the Foundry Methodist Church at 16th and P Streets).

2. It would be desirable to encourage grass and maintenance within the city's tree spaces and tree-lawns. We suggest that in the cases where the shelters are located across the tree space grass strip, paving between the sidewalk or shelter and the curb would be desirable. We find the potential for this condition in DC-MB-A-61, -64, -83, -89, -91, -100, -103, and -109.

3. There is also the question of locating the shelters in front of monumental buildings and landscape features, particularly when they are within view of the Capitol. The vistas of the Library of Congress and the Bartholdi Fountain would both be impaired by the proposed shelters in DC-MB-A-88, -96, and -106. We suggest relocation or elimination of these shelters.

Exhibit K.

The Commission appreciated having an opportunity to comment on these individual designs and looks forward to inspecting the first installations.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

30 October, 1973

Dear Mr. Dimcoff,

At its September 19, 1973 meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the proposed design for the permenent seal of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The Commission felt that the visual symbolism, which had a commercial look to it, was neither very good technically nor readily understandable, and disapproved the new seal.

We recommend retention of the "temporary" design based on the Great Seal of the United States. The seal has dignity, is widely used, and is immediately identifiable with the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Albert S. Dimcoff, Director
Office of Resource Utilization
Consumer Product Safety Commission
Washington, D.C. 20016

Exhibit L.

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO — CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
JANE O. DART — EDWARD STONE, JR.
KEVIN ROCHE — GEORGE WEYMOUTH
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary



708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324


Mr. Douglas Oler
Baltimore District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

5 October, 1973

Dear Mr. Oler:

This will confirm the action of the Commission on September 19th regarding the preliminary designs of the Domiciliary West "A" Building at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

We are glad to see the general direction your new developments are taking. A move to smaller buildings, to smaller lounges and fewer numbers of rooms per unit is only to be welcomed. Our feeling is that your move is not quite far enough.

Both the employment of three identical units, and the rather rigid geometry of the site reinforce the regimentation of the design and diminish the progress made toward a more humane character. It may be appropriate to reexamine the premises establishing the three identical buildings. While the relatively low height of the proposed structures is desirable, it is not absolutely necessary to have them all the same height. Some variation will most certainly help to soften the rigidity we are calling into question.

The same can be said for the site plan. Some variation in the approach, with central circulation along a spine connecting the units, might serve the needs of the men a little more directly and also contribute to a more human scale than can be achieved in a single large space as presently conceived.

The Commission appreciates the opportunity to view the master plan at an early stage. Our next meetings are scheduled for 17 October and 20 November, and we will be happy to consider the designs further at those times.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Exhibit M.